

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION,
Plaintiff,

v.

JULIE ANNE DARRAH and
VIVID FINANCIAL
MANAGEMENT, INC.,
Defendants.

2:23-cv-08843-DSF-AGR

Order re Motion for Default
Judgment

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission's motion for default judgment as to Defendant Vivid Financial Management, Inc. Dkt. 97 (Mot.). The Court finds that there is an ambiguity in the monetary amount the SEC seeks and therefore orders the SEC to file supplemental briefing to address the discrepancy.

The SEC's complaint alleges that Defendant Julie Anne Darrah and Vivid violated, among other things, the antifraud provisions of the securities laws. Dkt. 1 (Compl.) ¶ 21. Central to these claims is Darrah's misappropriation of "approximately \$2.25 million in funds from the accounts of nine defrauded clients." Id. ¶ 7.

The SEC's motion, however, describes only eight of the nine clients; it does not mention client C.H.,¹ who retained Darrah in March 2022. Compare Mot. at 3-4 with Compl. ¶¶ 24-94. Nevertheless, the SEC appears to include the amount misappropriated from that C.H. in its request for monetary remedies. Compare Compl. ¶¶ 31 (\$1,057,800 from S.S.), 43 (\$578,400 from M.S.), 51 (\$242,000 from C.H.), 59 (\$5,793 from C.H. and C.L.), 65-67 (\$200,000 from B.C.), 75 (\$96,200 from B.H.), 84 (\$27,937 from D.C.), 93 (\$39,200 from P.S.) with Mot. at 1 (seeking disgorgement and a civil penalty, each amounting to \$2,247,330).

The SEC is ordered to file a supplemental brief addressing this discrepancy. If the SEC's requested disgorgement amount changes as a result, then the SEC is directed to recalculate its requested prejudgment interest. In any event, prejudgment interest should be recalculated through October 1, 2025. The supplement is to be filed no later than September 29, 2025.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 22, 2025



Dale S. Fischer
United States District Judge

¹ There are two clients named C.H. in the complaint. Compl. ¶¶ 47, 57. The SEC's motion mentions the C.H. who retained Darrah in May 2020 but not the C.H. who retained Darrah in March 2022. Id. ¶¶ 47, 57; Mot. at 3.